1	BEFORE THE ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION			
2				
3	IN THE MATTER OF: )			
4	ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION ) On Its Own Motion ) 02-0689			
5	Amendment of 83 Ill. Adm. Code 758. )			
6 7	Chicago, Illinois August 13, 2003			
8	Met, pursuant to notice.			
9	BEFORE:			
10	Ms. Leslie Haynes, Administrative Law Judge.			
11	APPEARANCES:			
12	MR. DOUGLASS A. DOUGHERTY 300 East Monroe Street Suite 306			
13				
14	Springfield, Illinois 62701 for Illinois Telecommunications			
15	Association; (telephonically)			
16	MS. SARAH NAUMER			
17	8000 Sears Tower Chicago, Illinois 60606			
18	for Verizon North, Inc., and Verizon South, Inc.;			
19	(telephonically)			
20				
21				
22				

1	APPEARANCES:
2	MR. MICHAEL WARD 1608 Barkley Boulevard
3	Buffalo Grove, Illinois 60089 for Illinois Public
4	Telecommunications Association; (telephonically)
5	MR. SEAN R. BRADY and
6	MS. BRANDY D.B. BROWN 160 North LaSalle Street
7	Suite C-800 Chicago, Illinois 60601
8	for staff ICC.
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	SULLIVAN REPORTING COMPANY, by FRANCISCO E. CASTANEDA, CSR,
17	License No. 084-004235
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

1		$\underline{I}  \underline{N}  \underline{D}  \underline{E}  \underline{X}$	
2			
3	Mitaga		Re- By
4	NONE.	<u>Direct</u> <u>Cross</u> <u>direc</u>	ct cross Examiner
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10	APPLICANT'S	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	<u>In Evidence</u>
11		NONE.	
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			

- 1 JUDGE HAYNES: Pursuant to the direction of
- the Illinois Commerce Commission, I now call
- 3 Docket 02-0689, Illinois Commerce Commission on
- 4 its own motion.
- 5 May I have the appearances for the
- 6 record, please.
- 7 MR. BRADY: You want to start up here?
- 8 JUDGE HAYNES: We'll start in the hearing
- 9 room.
- 10 MR. BRADY: Appearing on behalf of staff of
- 11 the Illinois Commerce Commission, Sean R. Brady
- and Brandy D.B. Brown, 160 North LaSalle Street,
- 13 Suite C-800, Chicago, Illinois 60601.
- JUDGE HAYNES: And on the telephone.
- 15 MR. DOUGHERTY: On behalf of the Illinois
- 16 Telecommunications Association, Douglass A.
- Dougherty, D-o-u-g-h-e-r-t-y, 300 East Monroe
- 18 Street, Suite 306, Springfield, Illinois 62701.
- 19 MS. NAUMER: On behalf of Verizon North, Inc.,
- and Verizon South, Inc., Sarah Naumer,
- N-a-u-m-e-r, the law firm of Sonnenschein, Nath &
- 22 Rosenthal, 8000 Sears Tower, Chicago, Illinois

- 1 60606.
- 2 MR. WARD: On behalf of the Illinois Public
- 3 Telecommunications Association, Michael Ward,
- 4 1608 Barkley Boulevard, Buffalo Grove, Illinois
- 5 60089.
- JUDGE HAYNES: Are there any further
- 7 appearances?
- 8 Let the record reflect there are none.
- 9 Would someone like to summarize what's
- 10 been going on since the last time we had a
- 11 status?
- MR. BRADY: Probably Mr. Doughtery would be
- the best since he's been in touch with the
- 14 legislation.
- MR. DOUGHERTY: Yeah. Sure. I think I
- 16 circulated a memorandum to -- a copy of a
- memorandum I wrote to Judge Haynes just letting
- the judge and the parties know that the governor
- 19 did, in fact, sign the senate bill.
- 20 And I think that the language in that
- 21 statute, which is now a public act, sort of
- 22 mitigates the need for this proceeding to

- 1 continue.
- 2 The language clearly states that there
- 3 are six exemptions to Admin. Code Part 758, which
- 4 would require the solicitation and remittance of
- 5 funds to the Digital Divide Elimination Fund.
- So because of that statutory language,
- 7 we think -- at least my belief is that -- the ITA
- 8 believes that the current rule is appropriate and
- 9 it need not be amended.
- 10 So since this docket was open on a
- 11 motion by the Illinois Commerce Commission, as my
- 12 memorandum stated, I would respectfully request
- that the Commission enter a motion to dismiss the
- 14 proceeding.
- JUDGE HAYNES: Does staff have a response to
- 16 that?
- MR. BRADY: Yeah. We have taken a look at the
- legislation; and at this time, we don't see a
- 19 need to continue forward with the language -- the
- changes that we had proposed originally.
- So we have no problem. I guess we
- 22 intend to file a motion to dismiss for the next

- day or so, and also a request of the Commission
- 2 to file with the Secretary State of Illinois a
- 3 notice of withdrawal of this rulemaking pursuant
- 4 to the APA. Since we have already gone through
- 5 first notice.
- 6 MR. DOUGHERTY: And this is Dougherty. The
- 7 ITA agrees wholeheartedly with staff's
- 8 recommendation on how to proceed in this case.
- 9 JUDGE HAYNES: Will this be a joint motion
- 10 perhaps of all the parties?
- MR. BRADY: We had not intended it as such.
- 12 We had proceeded on our own at this time.
- JUDGE HAYNES: I'm just procedurally wondering
- if everyone doesn't sign off on it, would a
- proposed order need to go out or does staff
- intend for this to be a docket entry or would
- 17 a -- by the Commission, or would an order need to
- 18 be entered?
- 19 MR. BRADY: We don't see the need for
- 20 necessarily an order to be entered. I think the
- initiating order put us at first notice, and I
- 22 think the key action that needs to be taken is,

- 1 since we've already sent the Secretary of State
- 2 notice of this, is that we would need to send
- 3 them a notice of withdrawal since they've already
- 4 been notified.
- 5 JUDGE HAYNES: Okay. So I will look for
- 6 staff's motion; and if it's not a joint motion,
- 7 other parties should file something indicating
- 8 that they agree or if they don't intend to
- 9 object, just so I'll know who's on board with the
- 10 motion.
- 11 And I'm not sure if an order is
- 12 necessary or not but --
- MR. BRADY: That might -- on one hand it might
- be necessary since we already have an initiating
- order that had found that these changes were
- 16 needed just as...
- JUDGE HAYNES: So, procedurally, would I mark
- it heard and taken today? I think I would.
- 19 MR. BRADY: Yes. I mean, I don't see us
- 20 bringing any evidence at this point. We're just
- going to be filing a motion to dismiss and the
- 22 request.

- 1 JUDGE HAYNES: Does anybody else want to add
- 2 anything?
- 3 MS. NAUMER: Your Honor, what time frame would
- 4 you like our responses for staff session to be
- 5 filed, the normal period or would you like them
- 6 earlier?
- 7 JUDGE HAYNES: Are we under some time pressure
- 8 because we filed first notice?
- 9 MR. BRADY: Well, the first notice was
- 10 published on November 15th by Illinois Register.
- And according to the APA, we have one year to
- complete both first notice and second notice by
- 13 that date.
- So that would be the only constraint.
- And that being three months away, I don't see it
- as being much of a constraint. But that will be
- 17 the only thing.
- JUDGE HAYNES: Well, just leave it with the
- 19 two months and one month.
- MR. BRADY: Two weeks and one week?
- JUDGE HAYNES: And two weeks and one week.
- 22 And if nobody disagrees, there won't even be the

1	reply period.
2	Anything else?
3	Hearing nothing
4	MR. DOUGHERTY: No, your Honor.
5	JUDGE HAYNES: Okay. I will mark this record
6	heard and taken. Thank you.
7	HEARD AND TAKEN
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	